

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 067

FL 017 718

AUTHOR Kilham, Christine A.
TITLE A Written Style for Oral Communicators?
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (8th, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, August 16-21, 1987).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT Notes on Translation; n123 p36-52
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Expressive Language; Foreign Countries; *Interpreters; Language Skills; *Language Styles; *Literary Devices; Oral Language; *Translation; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS Australia

ABSTRACT

While there has been much interest in the differences between oral and written language styles, studies have focused on the relative use of certain features. Little attention has been paid to the cultural value given to language style in languages with a literary tradition versus value given to style in those with a non-literary traditions. All translators, whether native speakers or not, must gear their translations to the specific audience of the passage, not by *Expressive Language; Language Skills; audience. Twenty-four references are listed. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (8th, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, August 16-21, 1987).

ED301067

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.A. Kilham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

A WRITTEN STYLE FOR ORAL COMMUNICATORS?

Christine A. Kilham

Christine A. Kilham has a B.A. in Education from Sydney University and a Ph.D. in Linguistics on Wik-Mungkan discourse from Australia National University. She joined SIL in 1966, has been involved in the New Testament translation for Wik-Mungkan, has conducted training workshops for mother-tongue translators, has been Linguistic Department Coordinator and Translation Department Coordinator, and is currently Program Consultant in the SIL Australia Aborigine and Islander Branch.

0 Introduction

In the mid 1970s and in the years following, a rash of small articles started to come out on the subject of written versus oral style in translation. These would not have been surprising had they detailed the reactions of members of societies with long literary traditions. But they did not. Rather, they described the reactions of members of cultures with no written literary tradition at all and, if introduced, of only a few years' standing. The papers came from expatriate translators working in

FL017718

minority languages in countries such as Papua New Guinea, Peru, Africa, Vietnam, and Aboriginal Australia.

Their experiences pointed them to the conclusion that speakers of non-literary languages have an innate feel for the need of different styles to be used for oral versus written modes. Ray Johnston (1976:66) puts it this way: "There is a grammar of the written mode, even in hitherto unwritten languages." Speakers of such languages are quick to discover that what sounds good on tape does not necessarily sound good on paper and vice versa. More than one expatriate translator has described how he transcribed a popular or amusing story that had been told on tape, tidied up any obvious errors, such as slips of the tongue or hesitations, and then printed it--expecting applause--only to find no one liked it, (e.g., Hooley 1976:82; Sandefur: personal communication). The reasons often went much deeper than issues like too much redundancy or repetition. To the translator's surprise, sometimes seemingly important grammatical features or phonological effects (e.g., ideophones) came under fire as well.

As Martha Duff points out (1973:2), if we just transcribe a recorded oral story and then print it, the resultant story on paper may actually lack a lot of the intended meaning, e.g., the meaning that was conveyed by intonation, voice quality, change in speech tempo, gestures, etc. There has to be structural compensation in the written mode for these. A speaker adapts his story or speech as he goes in response to the hearers, so that the hearers have a part in structuring what the speaker says. But, while any good writer has his audience clearly in mind while he writes, he cannot change the mood or tempo of his story half-way through as a reaction to the mood or interest of the audience; he cannot back up and paraphrase or explain further when he senses lack of understanding; and he cannot be sure how much in the way of background information, presuppositions, and cultural background he has in common with his potential audience. These are things that native speakers of non-literary languages seem to become quickly aware of once they are exposed to seeing their language on paper. Some of their reactions that then follow may seem predictable (at least to those exposed to the issue), but others are not and may differ from language to language. Thus an acceptable written style is for them to develop, not for expatriate translators to prescribe. According to Joe Grimes (personal communication), once the idea of written style gets a hold, it may only take 2-3 years to develop. (It may take much longer also!)

1 Some distinctions discussed

In the appendix to this paper, I have attempted to catalogue and describe some of the distinctions linguists are observing between written and oral communication as it is being developed by speakers of non-literary languages.¹ Some of these are in line with what we might expect--less redundancy, greater explicitness, a tighter organization of the text, more careful sequencing, a purist tendency--but others have surprised, even shocked, expatriate translators. For example, Johnston (1976:66) says: "Head-tail linkage has been described as the life-blood of the narrative discourse in PNG." However, the mother-tongue speakers of the Nakanai language, in which he worked, wanted to cut it all out of written materials. Others have reacted similarly, at least to wanting it severely reduced.

In some languages emotive words or affixes are cut out or severely reduced in written materials. For example, in Wik-Mungkan, the Australian Aboriginal language in which I worked, there is an emotive suffix *-wey* which indicates feelings of compassion towards another or of the speaker's sensitivity towards himself. In one oral text where this suffix occurred 17 times, it was edited out 14 times by a native speaker who was working on the story, prior to it being printed and used in the school.

I spent quite a bit of time writing a dissertation about the thematic organization of Wik-Mungkan and described the grammatical devices used for indicating prominence at various levels--the fronting, the tagging, the special topic suffixation, special topic clauses, and combinations of these. Then I returned to the translation desk and made an earnest effort to apply all I had learned, so that the translation would match natural text in the use of prominence features. However, in time we came to realize that Wik-Mungkan speakers, while they did not cut these prominence devices out all together in written material, preferred to use them far less and far more selectively! (Eckert 1981:29). In some other Australian Aboriginal languages, namely Kriol and Pitjantjatjara, a similar thing happens with their emphasis suffixes or particles. But in all cases, when native speakers are reading

¹ Apart from reading and from the observations I have made during the course of a translation program in Wik-Mungkan, an Australian Aboriginal language, I have also had feedback from the following expatriate or mother-tongue translators working in Australia: Ann Eckert (previously worked in Wik-Mungkan, now working in Pitjantjatjara; Kathy Glasgow (Burrarra); Marie Godfrey (Tiwi); Jim Marsh (Martu Wangka); Ken Passi (Miriam); John Sandefur (Kriol); Judie Stokes (Anindilyakwa); and Steve Swartz (Warlpiri). I have been very grateful for all of their ideas and information.

translation publicly, they will frequently add emphasis or topic affixes back in!

The key to the difference between the written and oral modes in this respect may be that there are more themes or more ideas in a stretch of speech compared with an equivalent stretch of writing. McCormick reported two studies (1985:41-2), Horowitz and Newman (1964) and Moscovici and Humbert (1968), in which both indicate this, also that speech is more discontinuous and associative, rather than proceeding by logical progression.

Another language feature used selectively in written style in Wik-Mungkan is the rhetorical question. These are used in Wik-Mungkan oral speech to create interest and often prepare the listener for a surprise. I had considered such questions to be one of the most colourful aspects of the language, e.g., "What did Louisa leave behind? Her teeth!" However, these also are used more selectively in written text than in oral (Eckert 1981:31).

So far, it is not so much clear-cut distinctions between written and oral modes that we have been talking about but a difference of degree in the use of certain features. In her paper, Eckert (1981:29-31) consistently describes not so much contrastive features but what she calls a far more selective focus in the written mode. Swartz also commented to me in a recent letter:

First of all I had hoped that a wide variety of statistical counts would yield some significant characteristics pointing to both similarities and differences between *oral*, *written*, *dictated*, and *translated* narrative styles. It seems offhand that most articles, one reads on this, seem to focus on the significantly vast differences between written and oral style, and this is sort of what I felt would happen. However, although differences did surface in such things as average number of words per clause and the amount of subordination, even these often fell within the range of what Grimes referred to as an acceptable statistical range.

These observations would line up with those of McCormick (1985:vi) that while there are general differences between speech and writing, these differences are not clear-cut. She claims that this is partly because some written texts have spoken characteristics, while some spoken discourse has written characteristics. One thing that quickly comes to mind is direct speech in a written text. Maybe we think, "Well,

at least that surely can be unadulterated oral style." However, I was interested to hear a lecturer say recently at a writers' workshop that even in dialogue in a novel or short story, a good writer would never produce speech exactly as it is spoken--it would be too boring, as people waffle on. So even the *spoken* parts of written texts may be a bit less spoken than in real speech; it is a matter of degree, not a clear-cut distinction.

Tannen (1982:15) also speaks to this issue. She talks of an oral/literate continuum, which she sees as a continuum of relative focus on interpersonal involvement versus message content.

In some cases, however, speakers of non-literary languages have some very definite ideas about features of the spoken language they do not want in written material. I used to think we had very free word order in Wik-Mungkan, and there are indeed a number of allowable permutations in oral speech, but we discovered in time that certain word orders are not acceptable in written materials at all. Several *normal*, hence more predictable, word orders emerged as being preferred for written texts. However, when Steve Swartz studied word order in oral, written, dictated, and translated narrative styles in Warlpiri, he discovered (counter to his expectations) that "regardless of the type of text, basic word order characteristics remained the same" (personal communication). So we cannot generalize.

Examples of the category of **not** (or very, very rarely) **allowed** by Kriol co-translators include front-shifting and back-shifting, emotive expressions, rough words, and certain clause orders. But these prohibitions bring their problems too. For example, in oral speech, if an object is to be put in focus in a sentence, it is fronted. But the Kriol co-translators will not allow the fronting of an object in written text for fear readers will get the participants mixed up. But when I questioned the linguist, John Sandefur, as to how an object could be put in prominence in written style, he did not have an answer--as yet. He suspects that maybe it can be done by giving the participant more focus earlier in the discourse or by punctuation but does not really know. The Kriol translation is very much geared towards an audience which is not highly literate--so we can assume one of two things. Either the written style is not developed sufficiently yet to cope with signalling some important kinds of prominence, or else in the interest of a not highly literate audience being able to understand the text, the translators are producing a rather flat style which lacks colour but at least is plain. But even this is open to question, since prominence is part of the meaning.

6 This whole issue is one of concern, since I think one of our most

important challenges in translation is to make adjustments, so that our text exhibits the same patterns of theme and prominence as the original.

A related area of concern here has been voiced by Steve Swartz (personal communication). He says that a study done by Edith Bavin and Tim Shopen on the influence of English upon Warlpiri children's speech showed "that their writing and speech increasingly mimics the English S-V-O order and exhibits less and less of subject and object noun deletion compared to the speech of the lesser schooled children." Adult Warlpiri's do not, however, exhibit a high degree of English interference. Since both noun deletion and word order in Warlpiri are intimately involved with signalling issues related to theme, prominence, contrast, and emphasis, then heavy English interference could create much confusion. Steve Swartz predicts that in the long term, English may well continue to exhibit more and more influence on written style in terms of noun deletion and word order. So he feels it is important that Warlpiri editors are trained to constantly keep in mind what constitutes more traditional Warlpiri style and what reflects English interference.

Obviously, the road to an acceptable written style is not smooth, if we define *acceptable* as one that has developed sufficient compensatory structures so that it can convey the same depth of meaning--both denotative and emotive--and reflect the same patterns of theme and prominence. And in many of our translation programs, I suspect we are at a midway point.

2 Implications

If the above is true and if it is also true, as we have said, that it must be the mother-tongue speakers themselves who develop the written style, then it points to the necessity of starting literacy programs early in the life of a translation project. Also, early in the program, we must encourage mother-tongue speakers to become creative writers and good written editors, so that we allow plenty of time for an acceptable written style to develop and for us to reflect that in the translation we are doing. I notice that Maria Villalobos (1985:15) insists that the mother-tongue co-translator should be a good author. McCormick (1985:188) talks of the stage "when new literates are able to write fluently and joyfully in a number of genres." Certainly it would be ideal to have that kind of modelling before us before major translation was done.

As part of preparing to translate certain passages or certain types of discourse, we have been encouraged to get natural texts--either spoken or written--which closely parallel a section of Scripture (e.g., Ham 1972:17, Crofts 1985:1). The reality is that most expatriate translators seem to have a good body of oral texts and not much in the way of written texts, if any at all. This may reflect the priority given by many twentieth century linguists to the study of spoken language, which in itself is probably a reaction to "the prior exaltation of the written word" (McCormick 1985:1). On the other hand, it may reflect genuine difficulty in inspiring interest in literacy and in creative writing. But wherever possible, I think we need to be gathering just as many written texts as oral ones and especially ones that are done by people recognized as good authors.

3 Now come the buts

But having said all the above, it is also true that a lot of the speakers of minority languages in the Third World are basically oral communicators and may have a very rich oral art. It may even be that very live oral communication and oral art are felt to be a part of a group's ethnic identity and group solidarity, contributing to some resistance to literacy. In some areas, there have been long years of literacy effort, but still there may be up to 90% who cannot read a single paragraph.

A particularly interesting book on this topic is by Herbert V. Klem, *Oral Communication of the Scripture--Insights from African Oral Art*. Klem describes the rich oral art of Nigeria--the proverbs, the folk songs, the dexterity with words used in storytelling, the singing and dancing at times such as harvesting, and the emphasis on audience participation and response. He also tells how the heavy emphasis on literacy by missions in many parts of Africa led to the emergence of a new elite--people who became leaders not on the basis of age or tribal status but on the basis of skill in a foreign method of instruction. Meanwhile, even after 100 years of effort in literacy, 90% of the people still may not be able to read in many parts of the country and cannot be reached with Bible knowledge via written communication. Klem sees this situation as being partly a result of resistance from those who see the emphasis on literacy as an attack on their oral art.

A somewhat similar attitude towards the written word is described by Brandt in her article on American Indian attitudes toward literacy and recording in the Southwest. She describes how speech is seen as alive and moist but writing as dead and dry. Speech is perceived

as creative, an integral part of performance, interaction, and social relationships. Writing, rather, is seen "as a static, negative, dead pole" (1981:193). As in the parts of Africa Klem describes, the usual result has been that very few people become literate in their own language.

There are quite a few parallels between the African situation as Klem describes it and the Australian Aboriginal one. There are also parallels with the world of Jesus' day. The masses, the ordinary people, whom Jesus often addressed probably were mostly oral communicators also.

Klem points out that even though the Bible is a written book, within the New Testament itself we find both oral and written communication. Paul employed both, and Jesus, he says, "had a largely oral ministry in an Aramaic milieu" (1982:xxi).

4 The Australian scene

Australian Aboriginal communities vary quite a bit. Nearly all could still be described as orally based, but in some there are a number of good readers--in either English or the vernacular or both, and a nucleus of those who can write well in one or both languages. In others, there would be a broad resistance to literacy, with just a few exceptions. In Australia, there are also translators working with Torres Strait Islanders. In general, Islanders seem to be more at home with reading.

Expatriate translators working with Australian Aborigines or Islanders, too, vary quite a bit in how they view oral versus written style. In our own case, we had pressure from the Aboriginal co-translators to use the written style they were developing, and my own awareness of and interest in the subject came from them. Our co-translators did a lot of the first draft writing and editing of each others' work. However, I would not say that our whole New Testament is in written style--far from it. There are quite a few places where it seemed appropriate to use an oral style, e.g., I Corinthians 4:7, 8 is very much Wik-Mungkan oral confrontational style and everyone loves it!

In the Torres Strait, some of the Islander co-translators are strongly in favor of a formal written style and exert quite strong pressure to go this direction.

In the case of the Kriol co-translators, while they draft the translation orally for John Sandefur to keyboard, much time is then spent while they read it back from the screen and make adjustments--many of which could be described as written style type of adjustments. However, they keep the audience very much in mind and aim at a

Good News Bible type of Kriol for those who are not highly literate. John Sandefur says, that in their case, the written style has developed not so much from people writing but from people reading, since very few Kriol speakers write much in Kriol.

Other translators have proceeded quite differently. Jim Marsh (personal communication) does not believe that he should encourage² the development of a written style by an elite group of good readers, since the culture is still orally based. He believes that the translation should be prepared to be read aloud, rather than silently. He feels that currently people are not spending the same amount of time in the evenings sitting around the campfire telling stories and thereby are experiencing cultural loss. He feels that the public reading and retelling and sharing of the Scriptures can help fill that gap, and that, therefore, the Scripture must **sound** like stories that are told to an audience.

Another translation team did not produce any written Scripture at all; rather, they prepared about two-thirds of the New Testament totally in cassette form. The style is very much an oral one, with much expansion and redundancy.

Another team has grappled with the question of oral versus written style in the Tiwi language, as they have prepared lectionary readings to be read aloud in church each Sunday. They have not used a straight oral style, on the grounds that it would be very hard to read. Oral style in Tiwi is very fast and verbose, and reading the same material aloud would take a **long** time compared with the same material spoken spontaneously. But they have added in context so that the hearer can know where he is. When Epistle material is translated for these lectionary readings, they have used at least one feature of oral style, i.e., a repetition of the paragraph theme at the end of each paragraph, so that the hearers can keep the main thread of the message.

Another translator feels strongly that when we discuss this whole issue, we are in danger of confusing two things--concise, true but dynamic translation and Scripture in Use (SIU). She feels that translation as she has described it--

concise, true but dynamic--must be done as a **base** for all sorts of SIU projects. Working from the translated **base**, Scripture can be adapted for various audio-

²However, note that other translators have not necessarily deliberately encouraged written style, rather it has been forced upon them by the reactions of the Aboriginal or Islander co-translators.

visual projects; it can be stylized by the individual as he expounds it. Without such a **true** and **concise** base all these projects will be missing a vital tool, and the results will often wander from the real message of any particular passage (Kathy Glasgow: personal communication).

Some of us recognize, however, that it is genuinely difficult to be concise as well as true and dynamic all at once, especially when there are big linguistic and semantic differences between the source and receptor languages.

We could sum up the routes that have been taken or could be taken as follows (note that these are three broad categories only and that many translation approaches fall somewhere in between):

First, a translator may produce written Scriptures intended for reading but modelled primarily on the oral speech patterns of the language. In this case, he will make the job of those who wish to read the Scriptures for themselves very difficult, maybe almost impossible, by failing to produce a readable style. It will not be a **concise** base for SIU projects such as Kathy Glasgow describes.

Second, a translator may produce Scriptures modelled primarily on the oral speech patterns of the language but intended only for audio or audio-visual presentation. He may do this on the grounds that the culture is orally based and that there is resistance to literacy. His approach may be effective to a point, but he will be denying Scripture in written form to those who may one day become motivated to read it for themselves, and he will miss out on providing a permanent reference base (for people to check, correct, and test their oral communication).

Third, a translator may produce Scripture modelled on the written style as developed by mother-tongue speakers of the language. How effective this will be will depend on how mindful the mother-tongue translators and editors have been of their audience. If their concept of written style is something that is formal, uses traditional vocabulary that only a few understand, and exhibits pressure from a more prestigious national language as well, then the translators may produce a concise base but not one that communicates well. On the other hand, they may develop a written style that is truly mindful of the audience and that conveys the meaning in an understandable and beautiful way. We then have a good base, but may still only have a small nucleus who can read and write well alongside a majority who

are resistant to literacy. However, this approach does not preclude parallel oral communication.

5 So--Where are we?

Klem's answer to the situation is that we don't throw away either literacy or the translated Scriptures--both are very important--but what is needed is to **start** orally using indigenous media, e.g., song or drama, so that people can approach scriptural material with their existing skills. He feels that if you begin orally you then prepare the way for the use of the Bible in written form, e.g., if people are introduced to the Scripture in oral form, they may stimulate a strong desire for reading skills.

Part of his dissertation describes an experiment in the use of African oral art--setting part of Hebrews to song--to teach biblical knowledge.

Klem's plan of attack sounds good; however, earlier in this paper I said that one implication of the awareness of written style by speakers of non-literary languages was to have some emphasis on literacy and creative writing early in our programs. This would allow plenty of time for an acceptable written style to develop. How can this go together with Klem's insistence that we must start using oral approaches? It seems to me that these two things are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but what we do need to make sure of is that we don't make literacy an all-consuming goal. We must not present literacy as confrontational to oral art, nor must we give the impression that we think Christian maturity is impossible without literacy.

Nor need we view *oral approaches* as nothing more than that, just approaches, hoped for stepping stones to literacy. Ideally, it seems, we need translation available in a variety of media throughout, in a continuing, on-going way, so that it is accessible to all different kinds of people. There may never be more than a small nucleus of good literates and good writers, but this *elite* need not be a negative force. They may indeed have a very important role of *liaison* between the illiterate or semiliterate oral communicators in their community and the "permanent reference base" in the form of the written word.

Another translator (Ann Eckert: personal communication) has commented on ways of bridging the gap between oral communication and reading difficult material. She says:

It seems that if we want the translation to be read and to communicate without a dependence on expatriate teaching, then along

with oral communication possibilities, we perhaps can give thought to *layers* of written presentation, i.e.:

- overviews
- summaries
- full translation

so that we provide for varying proficiencies of reading and gradually lead the people into the complexities of e.g., Romans, Hebrews, 1, 2 Corinthians, etc.

6 Conclusion

It may seem obvious to conclude by coming back to the point that all translators, whether expatriate or mother tongue, need to keep the question "For whom am I translating?" in strong focus. But this is not as simple as it sounds. In some cultures verbal skill and dexterity is very important and gives a person status. A translator from such a culture may really struggle to play down that cultural value in the interests of his translation being understood. In other cultures some types of religious knowledge may have been secret and considered the exclusive property of the older men. Christians from such cultures may find that it does not come naturally to translate Scripture in a way that all and sundry can understand and grasp. Even without such factors, no society presents a totally homogeneous audience, so we are going to end up with a compromise of some sort.

In conclusion, it seems our task is not so much considering oral *versus* written style, but asking how we can best combine oral and written modes to communicate most effectively to our audience(s).

APPENDIX

Some differences observed

In this appendix I attempt to catalogue some of the distinctions linguists are observing between written and oral speech in non-literary languages. These observations come very largely from the South Pacific area.

Redundancy and repetition

There is strong reaction against reflecting the full gamut of redundancy patterns of oral speech in written material (Eckert 1981:29,30; Godfrey 1985:34-35; Hurd 1979:84).

In my own experience, I first tried to reflect in our translation such features of oral Wik-Mungkan as cycling, amplification, paraphrase, and recapitulation that we had studied at a discourse workshop in 1970. More than once, either after a public reading at church, or during editing by a co-translator, there was quite a negative reaction that we were going "round and round," or "saying the same thing over and over." We reduced the redundancy as a result.

Some redundancy on lower levels is reduced too, e.g., a common construction in oral Kriol is a pronoun followed by a noun phrase. Nearly all these pronouns are erased in translation by Kriol co-translators.

Explicitness

It seems to be a common observation that there are many ways in which written texts are made more explicit, e.g., a greater use of free pronouns versus pronominal affixes, more nouns or noun phrases used, locative nouns used instead of adverbs, less ellipsis, greater use of quotation formulas pre-quote and post long-quote. (Eckert 1981:30, 31; Deibler 1976:78; Duff 1973:3-4; Stokes, Sandefur: personal communication)

Swartz (personal communication) notes that for Warlpiri:

In looking at the statistical counts I made concerning subject deletion, I note the following: 74% of subjects in oral texts were deleted, 65% of subjects in dictated texts, 59% in written texts, and 61% in Scripture.

Similar counts were observed for object and indirect object.

Organization of text

More than one person has stated that more attention is paid to sequencing and careful organization of material in written text than in oral. (Eckert 1981:29 for Wik-Mungkan, and Eckert for Pitjantjatjara also; Sandefur: personal communication for Kriol; Duff 1973:2).

Aperture

In some languages, a more formal announcement of the discourse topic is preferred in written style than in oral style (Eckert 1981:29; Hurd 1979:86; Ken Passi: personal communication). Structures such as, "I am going to tell you a story about so and so" are replaced by more title-like structures, e.g., "This is the story of so and so."

Topicalization, focus

In Wik-Mungkan there are various devices for indicating prominence. In written texts these are used far less than in speech (Eckert 1981:30). However, when reading Scripture publicly, a reader will frequently add prominence devices!

In Kriol both back-shifting and front-shifting are rarely allowed in written speech (Sandefur: personal communication), apparently because of the danger of mixing up participants.

Also in Kriol, the occurrence of the particle *na*, which has emphasis as one of its functions, is severely reduced in the written mode. However, when reading publicly, Kriol readers will add some extra *na* particles here and there. (Something similar occurs with emphasis suffixes in Pitjantjatjara [Eckert: personal communication]).

Linkage (via conjunctions)

One would think that conjunctions would be used more explicitly and more frequently in the written mode, and in some languages, this is so (Hurd 1979:85; Sandefur: personal communication). But it also seems a hard area to predict, e.g., in Wik-Mungkan, the conjunction *yaa* 'so then, all right' is severely reduced in the written mode (Eckert 1981:30), but the roughly equivalent conjunction in Kriol, *wal* is used far more! (Sandefur: personal communication)

Linkage (tail-head)

In section 1, Johnston was quoted as saying that tail-head linkage was not acceptable in written Nakanai. Hurd (1979:84) records a similar observation for Nasioi, a language of Bougainville.

In Wik-Mungkan such linkage is used far less in the written mode and used far more selectively, e.g., before new major activities only (Eckert 1981: 30). In Pitjantjatjara it is far less acceptable in written style (Eckert: personal communication).

In Kriol, Sandefur states (personal communication) that there is no way tail-head linkage is accepted in written speech, and this is also true for Tiwi (Godfrey 1985:34).

Word order

In Wik-Mungkan there are a number of allowable permutations in speech. But in written material, certain combinations are not acceptable at all. Certain word orders are preferred, apparently because of their greater predictability (Eckert 1981:30).

Clause order

In Kriol a sentence like "When it rains, we will go home" could be said with reversed clause order in oral speech, but not in written. If put in reverse order in written form, it would likely be read as parts of two sentences regardless of what punctuation signals may be present or not present, e.g.:

"We will go home when it rains!" could be read as:

"We will go home. When it rains. . ."

Ideophones

For Kriol, John Sandefur reports that ideophones are not allowed in serious written material, such as Scripture.

In the Wik-Mungkan translation, our co-translators did not apply any such ban, though there would be less ideophones than in normal speech--but this may reflect the subject matter as much as anything.

Rough words

Sandefur reports also for Kriol that words perceived as *rough* are not accepted in the written mode, e.g., *stingkinwan* describing a dead body decaying had to be changed to "his body had gone bad."

Emotive word and particles

In some languages emotive words and suffixes are cut out or severely reduced in written text (Eckert 1981:31; Sandefur: personal communication), e.g., in Kriol, words like *bobala* 'poor fellow' are not acceptable in written style, but compensatory adverbial forms are used in written speech, e.g., "They said in an unhappy way."

Contractions and full forms

Some record that contractions or shortened forms, e.g., of verbs or pronominal prefixation, are replaced by full forms (Deibler 1976:77; Stokes: personal communication). By decree (of Kriol speakers) fuller forms are used in the Kriol Baibul, but the shorter forms are acceptable to good readers.

Sentence length and complexity

Several in PNG have recorded that for written speech the sentences are shorter, though not necessarily less complex (Hurd 1979:86; Deibler 1976:78; Irwin 1976:75).

In Pitjantjatjara two independent clauses joined by a conjunction will often be replaced by secondary verb(s) and one main verb when material is being edited for the written mode (Eckert: personal communication).

For Kriol, Sandefur reports that sentence complexity in written speech is undoubtably higher and that far more information is packed into clauses than in the case of oral speech.

Purist tendency

Several have recorded that loan words are frowned upon in written speech and that out-of-fashion, but more precise, language is often desired by some in written speech--especially the older folk (Eckert 1981:31; Deibler 1976:78; Eckert: personal communication regarding Pitjantjatjara).

Other

Sandefur (personal communication) mentions that appositional phrasing is not appreciated in written style in Kriol.

Rhetorical questions are a device in Wik-Mungkan that create interest or prepare the listener for a surprise. These are used more selectively in written text than in oral (Eckert 1981:31).

In Gahuku, interestingly enough, imperatives are not permitted in written form. Nor are postscript sentences, e.g., expressing reason or purpose, following the final verb (Deibler 1976:78).

In Pitjantjatjara the amount of direct speech is reduced in written communication as the story proceeds or replaced by reported speech (Eckert: personal communication).

References

- Adams, B. 1972. "Wolaamo Fable: The Editing of Oral Literature." *Notes on Literacy* 13:24-29.
- Banker, J. 1983. "How Can We Improve Translations Stylistically?" *Notes on Translation (NOT)* 94:16-21.
- Brandt, E.A. 1981. "Native American Attitudes Toward Literacy and Recording in the Southwest." *The Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest* 4(2):185-195.
- Crofts, M. 1985. "Mother-tongue Translator Training and One-Book Workshop Wedded." *NOT* 109:1-12.
- Deibler, E. 1976. "Differences Between Written and Oral Styles in Languages Near Goroka." *Read* 11(3):77-79.
- Duff, M. 1973. "Contrastive Features of Written and Oral Texts." *NOT* 50:2-13.
- Eckert, A. 1981. "Analysis of Written Style--An Imperative for Readable Translations?" *NOT* 85:27-31.
- Frank, L.E. 1983. "Characteristic Features of Oral and Written Modes of Language: Additional Bibliography." *Notes on Linguistics (NOL)* 25:34-37.
- Farnsworth, R. 1976. "Developing a 'Plain Language' Style." *Read* 11(3):71-73.
- Godfrey, M. 1985. "Repetition of Tiwi at Clause Level." *Work Papers of SIL-AAB Series A* 9:1-38.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. "Spoken and Written Language." Deakin University.
- Ham, P. 1972. "Different Styles for Different Kinds of Materials." *NOT* 45:17.
- Hooley, B. 1976. "Development of Editors for Unwritten Languages." *Read* 11(3):80-84.
- Hurd, C. 1979. "A Study of Oral Versus Written Nasioi Discourse." *Read* 14(2):84-86.
- Irwin, Barry. 1976. "Written and Oral Language in Southern Chimbu." *Read* 11(3):74-76.
- Johnston, R.L. 1976. "Devising a Written Style in an Unwritten Language." *Read* 11(3):66-70.
- , 1977. "Distinctive Aspects of the Syntax of Written Language in Local Languages of Papua New Guinea: Development of a Literary Mode in the Languages of Non-Literary Communities." Paper presented to the 48th ANZAAS Congress, Melbourne. Mimeo.
- Kilham, C.A. 1977. *Thematic Organization of Wik-Mungkan Discourse*, Pacific Linguistics Series B. No. 54. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Klem, H.V. 1982. *Oral Communication of the Scripture: Insights from African Oral Art*. William Carey Library.
- Leutkemeyer, J., C.V. Antwerp, and G. Kindell. 1983. "Bibliography of Spoken and Written Language." *NOL* 25:25-34.
- McCormick, P.G. 1985. "Exploring the Distinctions Between Spoken and Written Language." M.A. thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.
- Swartz, S.M. 1988. "Thematic and Pragmatic Constraints on Zero Anaphora and Word Order in Warlpiri Narrative Texts." M.A. thesis, Pacific College of Graduate Studies, Melbourne.
- Tannen, D. 1982. "The Oral/Literate Continuum in Discourse." *Spoken and Written Language - Exploring Orality and Literacy* (in *Advances in Discourse Processes* Vol 9. Ed. D. Tannen. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation) 1-17.
- Villalobos, M. 1985. "Who Should Do the Translation?" *NOT* 105:8-19.